

R E M A R K S

The office action of January 11, 2006 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-5 remain in this case, and claims 6-9 are cancelled.

Claim 1 was amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. Support for the amendments made to claim 1 are found in Figures 1, 2, and 3 and page 3, lines 6-7, 17-19, and page 4-5, lines 24-2. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 2 and 4 were also amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. No new matter has been entered.

The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Office Action.

Interview Summary

The Applicant's agent, Lynda Wood, had a telephone interview with the Examiner, on April 10, 2006. Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting the interview.

Exhibit A was submitted by facsimile prior to the interview showing the Applicant's present invention in comparison to the invention of Thompson during the telephonic interview.

During the telephonic interview on April 10, 2006, claim 1 was discussed in relation to Thompson (US 2,179,967). Cole (US 5,711,187) was also discussed. The Examiner agreed that clarification of the claims to show the location of the side portions and the central portions on the tooth would be allowable.

Applicant believes that this statement satisfies the requirements to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview, and accurately represents the substance of the interview conducted. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' agent would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claim 2 and believes that these amendments have fully addressed the Examiner's rejection, and the claim is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §102

4. Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson (US 2,179,967). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Thompson discloses a gear wheel with teeth that have a reinforcing member or a cap that covers the entire tooth, after the tooth has been formed. The reinforcing member surrounds the entire outer profile of the tooth. The reinforcing member has a first hardness and the tooth underneath the reinforcing member or cap has a second hardness.

As stated in Applicant's amended claim 1, the teeth of the sprocket are comprised of "a leading surface and a trailing surface, rotationally opposite the leading surface, each surface comprising side portions of a first hardness on inside edges and outside edges of the surfaces and a central portion between the side portions of a second hardness, less than the first hardness, wherein the side portions on the inside edges and the outside edges of the side surfaces contact the plurality of link plates of the silent chain."

Thompson fails to disclose two different hardnesses across the leading and trailing surfaces. More specifically, Thompson fails to disclose side portions of a first hardness on the inside and outside edges of the surfaces and a central portion between the side portions of a second hardness as required by Applicant's amended claim 1. Instead, Thompson discloses a single hardness across the entire leading surface and trailing surface of the tooth that extends from the inside edge of the surface to the outside edge of the surface.

Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of independent claim 1 as being anticipated by Thompson (US 2,179,967) is overcome. Dependent claims 3-5, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 1, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

11. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (US 2,179,967) in view of Cole et al. (US 5,711,187).

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over Thompson (US 2,179,967) and Cole et al. (US 5,711,187), individually and in combination, for the reasons given above in respect to the section 102 rejection of claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. The argument above as to the novelty of claim 1 is repeated here by reference.

Therefore, claim 4, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 1 should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations it contains. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
Naoji Sakamoto

By: /lmw #53791/
Lynda Wood, Reg. No. 53,791
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: April 11, 2006